

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-5, 7-13 and 15-79 are pending the application, with claims 1, 26, 48, and 64 being independent. Applicant cancels claims 6 and 14 without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer of the subject matter. Applicant amends claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-12, 16, 17, 22, 23, 25-36, 38, 39, 43, 44, 48, 49, 50, 53, 54, 56, 59, 60, 64, 65, 66, 71, 73, and 74 to further clarify features of the claimed subject matter. The original specification and drawings support these claim amendments, for example paragraphs [0015] and [0026]. Therefore, claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-12, 16, 17, 22, 23, 25-36, 38, 39, 43, 44, 48, 49, 50, 53, 54, 56, 59, 60, 64, 65, 66, 71, 73, and 74 are presented and directed to subject matter of the original disclosure.

CLAIM REJECTIONS 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2-5, 7-13 and 15-79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0143760 to Alkove et al. (hereinafter “Alkove”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Without conceding the propriety of the stated rejections, and only to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant amends **independent claim 1** to clarify further features of the subject matter. Amended claim 1 now recites a computer-readable storage medium encoded with a data structure for use in an image file to store data, the data structure comprising (emphasis added):

a data portion comprising:

first *still* image data related to a first multimedia stream of multimedia data, *wherein the first still image data represents at least a first pixel format*;

first arbitrary data related to a second multimedia stream of multimedia data, *wherein the second multimedia stream comprises second still image data, and wherein the second image data represents at least a second pixel format*; and

a header portion comprising:

a first header object comprising information related to the first multimedia stream; and

a second header object comprising information related to the second data multimedia stream.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Office has failed to show that Alkove discloses such a computer-readable storage medium.

The Office fails to show that Alkove discloses a container file image for still images

The Office has failed to show that Alkove discloses a container file image for still images. The Office cites Figure 2 and more specifically, reference number 204 and “video objects”. *See*, Office Action, paragraph 8.

In contrast, Applicant’s amended claim 1 recites “*first still image data related to a first multimedia stream of multimedia data, wherein the first still image data represents at least a first pixel format, first arbitrary data related to a second multimedia stream of multimedia data, wherein the second multimedia stream comprises second still image data, and wherein the second image data represents at least a second pixel format.*” As the Office has failed to show that Alkove discloses these recited features, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is not anticipated by Alkove.

Independent claims 26, 48, and 64 are directed to a method for forming an image container file for storing data associated with one or more multimedia streams, a system for storing image data, and means for collecting image data and generating an image container file, respectively, and each is allowable for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1. For example, the Office has failed to show that Alkove discloses *“a first still image data derived from the collected image data...wherein the first still image data represents at least a first pixel format...wherein the first arbitrary data comprises second image data where the second image data represents at least a second pixel format,”* as recited in Applicant’s amended claim 26. Furthermore, the Office has failed to show that Alkove discloses *“...wherein the first multimedia stream to include first still image data derived from image data received by the image data receiver...,”* as recited in Applicant’s amended claim 48. And furthermore, the Office has failed to show that Alkove discloses *“...wherein the first multimedia stream includes first still image data derived from image data received by the image data receiver...,”* as recited in Applicant’s amended claim 64.

Dependent claims 2-5, 7-13, 15-25, 27-47, and 49-63, and 65-75 depend directly from independent claims 1, 26, 48 and 64, respectively, and thus are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. **Dependent claims 76 and 77 depend from independent claim 1 and dependent claims 78 and 79 depend from claim 26** and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. Therefore, dependent claims 2-25, 27-47, 49-63, and 65-79 are also allowable for their own recited features that, in combination with those recited in claims 1, 26, 48, and 64, are not shown by the Office to be disclosed by Alkove.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the Office has failed to show that each and every feature is disclosed, the claims are not anticipated by Alkove. Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejections be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-5, 7-13 and 15-79 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt allowance for the subject application. If any issue remains unresolved that would prevent allowance of this case, the Office is requested to contact the undersigned attorney to resolve the issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC

Date: January 22, 2008

By: /Emmanuel A. Rivera/
Emmanuel Rivera
Reg. No. 45,760
512 344 9931